## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,307,574 (hereinafter "Ashe").

Claim 1 includes a limitation of launching an application program to access the graphic file to display a control element from the graphic file on a graphical user interface. Ashe does not teach such a limitation, and as a result does not anticipate claim 1. Specifically, Ashe teaches several core class objects to instruct a drawing module to *draw* an appropriate element for an indicated state (Column 8, lines 1-3). Each core class object includes a set of routines for calling out the appropriate drawing modules to draw each of the elements of the control objects (Column 8, lines 6-9). Ashe teaches where the control objects are drawn by a drawing module, and not displayed from a graphic file. As a result, each time a control object is called in Ashe, a drawing module draws the element according to instructions in the code. Claim 1, on the other hand, *displays* a control element from the graphic file. As a result, Ashe does not anticipate claim 1.

Further, the Examiner asserts that hierarchical program code used to display a GUI is a graphical file. The Applicants respectfully disagree. According the page 13 of the specification, a graphic file may be produced by

Appl. No. 09/679,692
Office action dated December 19, 2003
Reply to Final Office action of October 22, 2003

any multi-layer type computer program for creating and manipulating images on a computer. This differs from hierarchical program code in that the code includes instructions for creating a graphical image according to the parameters of that code. On the other hand, a graphical file can be created by a user in a graphics editing program and saved separately, where it can later be accessed. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the hierarchical program code in a graphic file are the same.

Claims 9, 17, and 25 include limitations similar to those discussed regarding claim 1. As a result, claims 9, 17, and 25 are also not anticipated by Ashe. The dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, and 26-32 depend from the above discussed independent claims. As a result, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the above mentioned independent claims. Since the independent claims are not anticipated by Ashe, the dependent claims are also not anticipated by Ashe.

Appl. No. 09/679,692
Office action dated December 19, 2003
Reply to Final Office action of October 22, 2003

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen M. Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: <u>December 19, 2003</u>

Arlen M. Hartounian
Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

Appl. No. 09/679,692
Office action dated December 19, 2003
Reply to Final Office action of October 22, 2003